

Equivariant Riemann-Roch theorems for curves over perfect fields

Helena Fischbacher-Weitz
Department of Pure Mathematics
University of Sheffield
Hicks Building, Hounsfield Road
Sheffield
S3 7RH

`h.fischbacher-weitz@shef.ac.uk`

Bernhard Köck (*communicating author*)
School of Mathematics
University of Southampton
Highfield
Southampton
SO17 1BJ

`b.koeck@soton.ac.uk`

Tel. 0044 23 8059 5125

Fax 0044 23 8059 5147

Abstract

We prove an equivariant Riemann-Roch formula for divisors on algebraic curves over perfect fields. By reduction to the known case of curves over algebraically closed fields, we first show a preliminary formula with coefficients in $\mathbb{Q}$. We then prove and shed some further light on a divisibility result that yields a formula with integral coefficients. Moreover, we give variants of the main theorem for equivariant locally free sheaves of higher rank.

Introduction

Let X be a smooth, projective, geometrically irreducible curve over a perfect field k and let G be a finite subgroup of the automorphism group $\text{Aut}(X/k)$. For any locally free G -sheaf $\mathcal{E}$ on X , we are interested in computing the equivariant Euler characteristic

$$\chi(G, X, \mathcal{E}) := [H^0(X, \mathcal{E})] - [H^1(X, \mathcal{E})] \in K_0(G, k),$$

considered as an element of the Grothendieck group $K_0(G, k)$ of finitely generated modules over the group ring $k[G]$. The main example of a locally free G -sheaf we have in mind is the sheaf $\mathcal{L}(D)$ associated with a G -equivariant divisor $D = \sum_{P \in X} n_P P$ (that is $n_{\sigma(P)} = n_P$ for all $\sigma \in G$ and all $P \in X$). If two $k[G]$ -modules are in the same class in $K_0(G, k)$, they are not necessarily isomorphic when the characteristic of k divides the order of G . In order to be able to determine the actual $k[G]$ -isomorphism class of $H^0(X, \mathcal{E})$ or $H^1(X, \mathcal{E})$, we are therefore also interested in deriving conditions for $\chi(G, X, \mathcal{E})$ to lie in the Grothendieck group $K_0(k[G])$ of finitely generated *projective* $k[G]$ -modules and in computing $\chi(G, X, \mathcal{E})$ within $K_0(k[G])$.

The equivariant Riemann-Roch problem goes back to Chevalley and Weil [CW], who described the G -structure of the space of global holomorphic differentials on a compact Riemann surface. Ellingsrud and Lønsted [EL] found a formula for the equivariant Euler characteristic of an arbitrary G -sheaf on a curve over an algebraically closed field of characteristic zero. Nakajima [Na] and Kani [Ka] independently generalized this to curves over arbitrary algebraically closed fields, under the assumption that the canonical morphism $X \rightarrow X/G$ be tamely ramified. These results have been revisited by Borne [Bo], who also found a formula that computes the difference between the equivariant Euler characteristics of two G -sheaves in the case of a wildly ramified cover $X \rightarrow X/G$. In the same setting, formulae for the equivariant Euler characteristic of a single G -sheaf have been found by the second author ([Kö1], [Kö2]). Using these formulae, new proofs for the results of Ellingsrud-Lønsted, Nakajima and Kani have been given [Kö1].

In this paper, we concentrate on the case where the underlying field k is perfect. Our main theorem, Theorem 3.4, is an equivariant Riemann-Roch formula in $K_0(k[G])$ when the canonical morphism $X \rightarrow X/G$ is weakly ramified and $\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{L}(D)$ for some equivariant divisor D . By reduction to the known case of curves over algebraically closed fields, we first show a preliminary formula with coefficients in $\mathbb{Q}$. The divisibility result needed to obtain a formula with integral coefficients is then proved in two ways: Firstly, by applying the preliminary formula to suitably chosen equivariant divisors; and secondly, in two situations, by a local argument. The following paragraphs describe the content of each section in more detail.

It is well-known that a finitely generated $k[G]$ -module M is projective if and only if $M \otimes_k \bar{k}$ is a projective $\bar{k}[G]$ -module. In Section 2 we give a variant of this fact for classes in $K_0(G, k)$ rather than for $k[G]$ -modules M (Corollary 2.2). This variant is much harder to prove and is an essential tool for the proof of our main result in Section 3.

The first results in Section 3 give both a sufficient condition and a necessary condition under which the equivariant Euler characteristic $\chi(G, X, \mathcal{E})$ lies in the image of the Cartan homomorphism $c : K_0(G, k) \rightarrow K_0(k[G])$. More precisely, when $\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{L}(D)$ for some equivariant divisor $D = \sum_{P \in X} n_P P$, this holds if the canonical projection $\pi : X \rightarrow X/G$ is weakly ramified and $n_P + 1$ is divisible by the wild part e_P^w of the ramification index e_P for all $P \in X$. When π is weakly ramified we furthermore derive from the corresponding result in [Kö2] the existence of the so-called ramification module $N_{G,X}$, a certain projective $k[G]$ -module which embodies a global relation between the (local) representations

$\mathfrak{m}_P/\mathfrak{m}_P^2$ of the inertia group I_P for $P \in X$. If moreover D is an equivariant divisor as above, our main result, Theorem 3.4, expresses $\chi(G, X, \mathcal{L}(D))$ as an integral linear combination in $K_0(k[G])$ of the classes of $N_{G,X}$, the regular representation $k[G]$ and the projective $k[G]$ -modules $\text{Ind}_{G_P}^G(W_{P,d})$ (for $P \in X$ and $d \geq 0$) where the projective $k[G_P]$ -module $W_{P,d}$ is defined by the following isomorphism of $k[G_P]$ -modules:

$$\text{Ind}_{I_P}^{G_P}(\text{Cov}((\mathfrak{m}_P/\mathfrak{m}_P^2)^{\otimes(-d)})) \cong \bigoplus^{f_P} W_{P,d};$$

here Cov means taking the $k[I_P]$ -projective cover and f_P denotes the residual degree.

Finding an equivariant Riemann-Roch formula without denominators amounts to showing that $W_{P,d}$ exists, i.e. that the left-hand side of the above is “divisible by f_P ”. To do this, we use our prototype formula *with* denominators, formula (4), and apply it to certain equivariant divisors D . If π is tamely ramified, we furthermore consider two situations where we can give a local proof of the divisibility result, yielding a more concrete description of $W_{P,d}$, see Proposition 3.5.

In Section 4, we give some variants of the main result that hold under slightly different assumptions. In particular, these variants hold for locally free G -sheaves that do not necessarily come from a divisor.

1 Preliminaries

The purpose of this section is to fix some notations used throughout this paper and to state some folklore results used later.

Throughout this section, let X be a scheme of finite type over a field k , and let $\bar{k}$ be an algebraic closure of k . For any (closed) point $P \in X$, let $k(P) := \mathcal{O}_{X,P}/\mathfrak{m}_P$ denote the residue field at P . Throughout this paper, let $\bar{X}$ denote the geometric fibre $X \times_k \bar{k}$, which is a scheme of finite type over $\bar{k}$, and let p denote the canonical projection $\bar{X} \rightarrow X$. Recall that p is a closed, flat morphism which is in general not of finite type. We will see later that in dimension 1, p is “unramified” in the sense that if $Q \in \bar{X}$ and $P = p(Q)$, then a local parameter at P is also a local parameter at Q . By Galois theory and Hilbert’s Nullstellensatz, we have for every $P \in \bar{X}$:

$$\#p^{-1}(P) = \# \text{Hom}_k(k(P), \bar{k}) \leq [k(P) : k] < \infty,$$

and equality holds if $k(P)/k$ is separable.

Let now G be a finite subgroup of $\text{Aut}(X/k)$. Since the homomorphism

$$\text{Aut}(X/k) \rightarrow \text{Aut}(\bar{X}/\bar{k}), \sigma \mapsto \sigma \times \text{id}$$

is injective, which is easy to check, we may view G as a subgroup of $\text{Aut}(\bar{X}/\bar{k})$. Since the elements of G act on the topological space of X as homeomorphisms, G also acts on $|X|$, the set of closed points in X . Analogously, G acts on the set $|\bar{X}|$ of closed points in $\bar{X}$.

Definition 1.1. A *locally free G -sheaf* (of rank r) on X is a locally free $\mathcal{O}_X$ -module $\mathcal{E}$ (of rank r) together with an isomorphism of $\mathcal{O}_X$ -modules $v_\sigma : \sigma^* \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathcal{E}$ for every $\sigma \in G$, such that for all $\sigma, \tau \in G$, the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \sigma^* \mathcal{E} & \xrightarrow{v_\sigma} & \mathcal{E} \\ \sigma^* v_\tau \uparrow & \nearrow v_{\tau\sigma} & \\ \sigma^*(\tau^* \mathcal{E}) & = & (\tau\sigma)^* \mathcal{E} \end{array}$$

If $\mathcal{E}$ is a locally free G -sheaf of finite rank, then the cohomology groups $H^i(X, \mathcal{E})$ ($i \in \mathbb{N}_0$) are k -representations of G . If moreover X is proper over k , then the $H^i(X, \mathcal{E})$ are finite-dimensional and vanish for $i > 0$ (see Theorem III.5.2 in [Ha]).

We denote the Grothendieck group of all finitely generated $k[G]$ -modules (i.e. finite-dimensional k -representations of G) by $K_0(G, k)$, as opposed to the notation $R_k(G)$ used by Serre in [Se2].

Definition 1.2. If X is proper over k , and $\mathcal{E}$ is a locally free G -sheaf of finite rank, then

$$\chi(G, X, \mathcal{E}) := \sum_i (-1)^i [H^i(X, \mathcal{E})] \in K_0(G, k)$$

is called the *equivariant Euler characteristic* of $\mathcal{E}$ on X .

For $P \in |X|$ or $P \in |\bar{X}|$, the *decomposition group* G_P and the *inertia group* I_P are defined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} G_P &:= \{\sigma \in G \mid \sigma(P) = P\}; \\ I_P &:= \{\sigma \in G_P \mid \bar{\sigma} = \text{id}_{k(P)}\} = \ker(G_P \rightarrow \text{Aut}(k(P)/k)). \end{aligned}$$

Here $\bar{\sigma}$ denotes the endomorphism that σ induces on $k(P)$. Note that for all $Q \in |\bar{X}|$, we have $G_Q = I_Q$ and $G_Q = I_P$, where $P := p(Q) \in |X|$.

In the following lemma, we will assume for the first time that the field k is *perfect*.

Lemma 1.3. *Assume that k is perfect. Let $\mathcal{F}$ be a coherent sheaf on X , and let $\bar{\mathcal{F}} := p^* \mathcal{F}$. Let P be a point in X , and let $\mathcal{F}(P) := \mathcal{F}_P \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{X,P}} k(P)$ be the fibre of $\mathcal{F}$ at P . Then the canonical homomorphism*

$$\mathcal{F}(P) \otimes_k \bar{k} \mapsto \bigoplus_{Q \in p^{-1}(P)} \bar{\mathcal{F}}(Q)$$

is an isomorphism. In particular, the canonical homomorphism

$$k(P) \otimes_k \bar{k} \rightarrow \bigoplus_{Q \in p^{-1}(P)} k(Q)$$

is an isomorphism.

Proof. It follows from Galois theory that for any separable finite field extension k'/k , the homomorphism

$$k' \otimes_k \bar{k} \rightarrow \bigoplus_{\text{Hom}_k(k', \bar{k})} \bar{k}$$

defined by

$$y \otimes z \mapsto (\varphi(y) \cdot z)_{\varphi \in \text{Hom}_k(k', \bar{k})}$$

is an isomorphism. Since k is perfect, by putting $k' = k(P)$ this implies the second part of the lemma, i.e. the special case where $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{O}_X$.

Since the lemma is a local statement on X , we may assume that X is affine. The general case then follows from the special case together with the definitions and basic properties of coherent sheaves and fibred products. $\square$

Proposition 1.4. *Assume that k is perfect. Let $\Omega_{X/k}$ be the sheaf of relative differentials of X over k . Then for every point $P \in |X|$, the canonical map*

$$\mathfrak{m}_P/\mathfrak{m}_P^2 \rightarrow \Omega_{X/k}(P)$$

is an isomorphism.

Proof. Let $\Omega_{k(P)/k}$ denote the module of relative differential forms of $k(P)$ over k . Using some basic properties of differentials and of the cotangent space in an affine setting, it follows from Corollary 6.5 in [Ku] that we have an exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow \mathfrak{m}_P/\mathfrak{m}_P^2 \rightarrow \Omega_{X/k}(P) \rightarrow \Omega_{k(P)/k} \rightarrow 0.$$

By Corollary 5.3 in [Ku], $\Omega_{k(P)/k}$ is trivial, so the map $\mathfrak{m}_P/\mathfrak{m}_P^2 \rightarrow \Omega_{X/k}(P)$ is an isomorphism. $\square$

Note that both Corollary 6.5 and Corollary 5.3 in [Ku] require $k(P)/k$ to be separable. Both Lemma 1.3 and Proposition 1.4 can be turned into equivariant statements in the following sense. If we require $\mathcal{F}$ to be a locally free G -sheaf, then for every point $P \in |X|$, we obtain an action of the inertia group I_P on the fibre $\mathcal{F}(P)$ by $k(P)$ -automorphisms. The action of I_P on the fibre $\Omega_X(P)$ of the canonical sheaf corresponds to the action on the cotangent space $\mathfrak{m}_P/\mathfrak{m}_P^2$ via the isomorphism from Proposition 1.4.

By letting I_P act trivially on $\bar{k}$, we can extend the action of I_P on $\mathcal{F}(P)$ to an action on the tensor product $\mathcal{F}(P) \otimes_k \bar{k}$. On the other hand, since $I_Q = I_P$ for any point $Q \in p^{-1}(P)$, I_P acts on the fibre $\mathcal{G}(Q)$ of any locally free G -sheaf $\mathcal{G}$ on $\bar{X}$ for any point $Q \in p^{-1}(P)$. In particular, this holds if $\mathcal{G} = p^*\mathcal{F}$ for a locally free G -sheaf $\mathcal{F}$ on X . With respect to these group actions, the isomorphism from Lemma 1.3 is an isomorphism of $\bar{k}[I_P]$ -modules.

We also have an action of the decomposition group G_P on any fibre $\mathcal{F}(P)$, but G_P only acts on the fibre via k -automorphisms, whereas I_P acts via $k(P)$ -automorphisms. G_P does act $k(P)$ -semilinearly on the fibre, that is, for any $\sigma \in G_P, a \in k(P)$ and $x, y \in \mathcal{F}(P)$ we have $\sigma.(ax + y) = (\bar{\sigma}.a)(\sigma.x) + \sigma.y$, where $\bar{\sigma}$ denotes the automorphism of $k(P)/k$ induced by σ .

Let now X be a smooth, projective curve over a perfect field k . Assume further that X is geometrically irreducible, i.e. that the geometric fibre $\bar{X} = X \times_k \bar{k}$ is irreducible. Then the curve X itself is irreducible.

The following lemma shows that although the canonical morphism $p: \bar{X} \rightarrow X$ is usually not of finite type, it can be thought of as an “unramified” morphism in the common sense, a fact that will be used frequently throughout this paper.

Lemma 1.5. *Let $Q \in |\bar{X}|$ be a closed point, and let $P := p(Q)$. Then every local parameter at P is also a local parameter at Q .*

Proof. Let t_P be a local parameter at P . Then t_P must be an element of $\mathfrak{m}_P \setminus \mathfrak{m}_P^2$, so (the equivalence class of) t_P is a generator of the one-dimensional vector space $\mathfrak{m}_P/\mathfrak{m}_P^2$ over $k(P)$. Hence, $t_P \otimes 1$ is a generator of the rank-1 module $\mathfrak{m}_P/\mathfrak{m}_P^2 \otimes_k \bar{k}$ over $k(P) \otimes_k \bar{k}$. By Lemma 1.3 and Proposition 1.4, we have a canonical isomorphism

$$\mathfrak{m}_P/\mathfrak{m}_P^2 \otimes_k \bar{k} \rightarrow \bigoplus_{Q \in p^{-1}(P)} \mathfrak{m}_Q/\mathfrak{m}_Q^2$$

which we can view as an isomorphism of modules over $k(P) \otimes_k \bar{k} \cong \bigoplus_{Q \in p^{-1}(P)} k(Q)$. Since this isomorphism must map $t_P \otimes 1$ to a generator of the right-hand side over $\bigoplus_{Q \in p^{-1}(P)} k(Q)$, the image of $t_P \otimes 1$ in each component $\mathfrak{m}_Q/\mathfrak{m}_Q^2$ must be a generator of $\mathfrak{m}_Q/\mathfrak{m}_Q^2$, i.e. the image of t_P under each induced homomorphism $p_Q : \mathcal{O}_{X,P} \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{\bar{X},Q}$ must be a local parameter at Q . $\square$

Let now G be a finite subgroup of $\text{Aut}(X/k)$. It is a well-known result that the quotient scheme $Y := X/G$ is also a smooth projective curve, with function field $K(Y) = K(X)^G$. The canonical projection $X \rightarrow Y$ will be called π . Let $P \in X$ be a closed point, $R := \pi(P) \in Y$. Let v_P be the unique normed valuation of the function field $K(X)$ associated to P , and let v_R be the unique normed valuation of $K(Y)$ associated to R . Then v_P is equivalent to a valuation extending v_R . For $s \geq -1$, we define the s -th ramification group $G_{P,s}$ at P to be the s -th ramification group of the extension of local fields $K(X)_{v_P}/K(Y)_{v_R}$. In particular, we have $G_{P,-1} = G_P$ and $G_{P,0} = I_P$.

The canonical projection $\pi : X \rightarrow Y$ is called *unramified* (*tamely ramified*, *weakly ramified*) if $G_{P,s}$ is trivial for $s \geq 0$ ($s \geq 1$, $s \geq 2$) and for all $P \in X$. We denote the ramification index of π at the place P by e_P , its wild part by e_P^w and its tame part by e_P^t . In other words, $e_P = v_P(t_{\pi(P)}) = |G_{P,0}|$, $e_P^w = |G_{P,1}|$ and $e_P^t = |G_{P,0}/G_{P,1}|$.

If $Q \in |\bar{X}|$ is a closed point, $P := p(Q) \in |X|$, then for every $s \geq 0$, we have $G_{Q,s} = G_{P,s}$ (by Proposition 5 in Chapter IV in [Se1] and Lemma 1.5). In particular, we have $e_P = e_Q$, $e_P^w = e_Q^w$ and $e_P^t = e_Q^t$.

2 A Cartesian diagram of Grothendieck groups

A $k[G]$ -module M is projective if and only if $M \otimes_k \bar{k}$ is a projective $\bar{k}[G]$ -module. In this section, we will now show variants of this well-known fact for classes in $K_0(G, k)$ rather than $k[G]$ -modules.

Let $K_0(k[G])$ denote the Grothendieck group of finitely generated projective $k[G]$ -modules. This is a free group generated by the isomorphism classes of indecomposable projective $k[G]$ -modules. The Cartan homomorphisms $c : K_0(k[G]) \rightarrow K_0(G, k)$ and $\bar{c} : K_0(\bar{k}[G]) \rightarrow K_0(G, \bar{k})$ are injective ([Se2], 16.1, Corollary 1 of Theorem 35), so $K_0(k[G])$ may be viewed as a subgroup of $K_0(G, k)$. The homomorphism

$$\beta : K_0(G, k) \rightarrow K_0(G, \bar{k})$$

defined by tensoring with $\bar{k}$ over k restricts to a homomorphism

$$\alpha : K_0(k[G]) \rightarrow K_0(\bar{k}[G]).$$

By Proposition (16.22) in [CR], both homomorphisms β, α are split injections.

Proposition 2.1. *The following diagram with injective arrows is Cartesian, i.e. it commutes and viewing the injections as inclusions, we have $K_0(\bar{k}[G]) \cap K_0(G, k) = K_0(k[G])$.*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} K_0(k[G]) & \xrightarrow{\alpha} & K_0(\bar{k}[G]) \\ c \downarrow & & \downarrow \bar{c} \\ K_0(G, k) & \xrightarrow{\beta} & K_0(G, \bar{k}) \end{array}$$

Proof. The commutativity is obvious. Now consider the extended diagram (with exact rows)

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & K_0(k[G]) & \xrightarrow{\alpha} & K_0(\bar{k}[G]) & \longrightarrow & M \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \downarrow c & & \downarrow \bar{c} & & \downarrow f \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & K_0(G, k) & \xrightarrow{\beta} & K_0(G, \bar{k}) & \longrightarrow & N \longrightarrow 0 \end{array}$$

where $M = \text{cok } \alpha$, $N = \text{cok } \beta$, and f is the homomorphism $M \rightarrow N$ induced by $\bar{c}$. By the Snake Lemma, there is an exact sequence of abelian groups

$$0 \rightarrow \ker c \rightarrow \ker \bar{c} \rightarrow \ker f \rightarrow \text{cok } c,$$

the first two modules being trivial since c and $\bar{c}$ are injective. Since α is a split injection, $M = \text{cok } \alpha$ is free over $\mathbb{Z}$, and therefore $\ker f$ must also be free over $\mathbb{Z}$. On the other hand, by Theorem (21.22) in [CR], we have $|G| \cdot \text{cok } c = 0$, so $\text{cok } c$ is a torsion module. Using the exactness of the sequence above, this implies $\ker f = 0$. Now an easy diagram chase completes the proof. $\square$

Proposition 2.1 says that given a class $\mathcal{C}$ in $K_0(G, k)$, $\mathcal{C}$ lies in the image of c if and only if $\beta(\mathcal{C})$ lies in the image of $\bar{c}$. The following corollary appears to be only slightly different from this, yet some additional tools will be required for its proof.

Corollary 2.2. *Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a class in $K_0(G, k)$. Then $\mathcal{C}$ is the class of a projective $k[G]$ -module if and only if $\beta(\mathcal{C})$ is the class of a projective $\bar{k}[G]$ -module.*

Before proving Corollary 2.2, we will need a few preliminary results on $k[G]$ -modules. Recall that a $k[G]$ -module is called *simple* if it is nonzero and has no proper $k[G]$ -submodules, and *indecomposable* if it is nonzero and is not a direct sum of proper $k[G]$ -submodules.

Proposition 2.3. (a) *For every simple $k[G]$ -module M , the $\bar{k}[G]$ -module $M \otimes_k \bar{k}$ is semisimple.*

(b) *Let $\{P_1, \dots, P_s\}$ be a set of representatives of the isomorphism classes of indecomposable projective $k[G]$ -modules, and let*

$$P_i \otimes_k \bar{k} = \bigoplus_{j=1}^{r_i} \bar{Q}_{ij}, \quad \bar{Q}_{ij} \text{ indecomposable projective } \bar{k}[G]\text{-modules.}$$

Then every indecomposable $\bar{k}[G]$ -module is isomorphic to some $\bar{Q}_{ij}$. Further $\bar{Q}_{ij} \cong \bar{Q}_{i'j'}$ implies that $i = i'$, i.e. there is no overlap between the sets of indecomposable $\bar{k}[G]$ -modules which come from different indecomposable $k[G]$ -modules.

Proof. This proposition is a variation of Theorem 7.9 in [CR]. In [CR], the algebraic closure $\bar{k}$ is replaced by a finite algebraic extension E of k , and part (b) is stated for *simple* modules rather than for indecomposable projective modules. Using only elementary algebraic methods, it can be shown that there is a finite algebraic extension E/k such that every simple $\bar{k}[G]$ -module can be realized as a simple $E[G]$ -module, i.e. every simple $\bar{k}[G]$ -module M can be written as $M = N \otimes_E \bar{k}$ for some simple $E[G]$ -module N . This suffices to derive part (a) from the result in [CR]. Furthermore, it is well-known that mapping every projective $k[G]$ -module P to the $k[G]$ -module $P/\text{rad } P$ gives a 1-1 correspondence between the isomorphism classes of indecomposable projective $k[G]$ -modules

and the isomorphism classes of simple $k[G]$ -modules, whose inverse is given by taking $k[G]$ -projective covers. We can thus deduce our proposition from the result in [CR], using that projective covers are additive (by Corollary 6.25 (ii) in [CR]) and commute with tensor products (by Corollary 6.25 (i) in [CR]). $\square$

Proof of Corollary 2.2. The “only if” direction is obvious. For the “if” direction, we note first of all that if $\mathcal{C}$ is a class in $K_0(G, k)$ and $\beta(\mathcal{C})$ is the class of a projective $\bar{k}[G]$ -module, then Proposition 2.1 yields that $\mathcal{C}$ can be viewed as a class in $K_0(k[G])$. Hence it suffices to show the “if” direction for classes $\mathcal{C} \in K_0(k[G])$, replacing the homomorphism β by its restriction α .

Let $\{P_1, \dots, P_s\}$ be a set of representatives of the isomorphism classes of indecomposable $k[G]$ -modules. Every $\mathcal{C} \in K_0(k[G])$ can now be written as a $\mathbb{Z}$ -linear combination of the classes $[P_i]$, and all coefficients of this linear combination are nonnegative if and only if $\mathcal{C}$ is the class of a projective module. Using Proposition 2.3, one now easily shows that if $\alpha(\mathcal{C})$ is the class of a projective module in $K_0(\bar{k}[G])$, then $\mathcal{C}$ is the class of a projective module in $K_0(k[G])$, which proves the assertion. $\square$

3 The equivariant Euler characteristic in terms of projective $k[G]$ -modules

By a theorem of Nakajima, the equivariant Euler characteristic of any locally free G -sheaf on X lies in the image of the Cartan homomorphism $c : K_0(k[G]) \rightarrow K_0(G, k)$, provided that the canonical projection $\pi : X \rightarrow Y = X/G$ is *tamely ramified*. In this section, we will also consider the more general case where π is *weakly ramified*. We give both a necessary condition and a sufficient condition for the equivariant Euler characteristic to lie in the image of c , provided that the G -sheaf in question has rank 1 (comes from a divisor). Under this condition, we state an equivariant Riemann-Roch formula in the Grothendieck group of projective $k[G]$ -modules.

We make the same assumptions and use the same notations as in section 1. In particular p denotes the projection $\bar{X} = X \times_k \bar{k} \rightarrow X$. Additionally, let $\bar{\pi}$ denote the canonical projection $\bar{X} \rightarrow \bar{Y} := \bar{X}/G = Y \otimes_k \bar{k}$, and let $\tilde{p}$ denote the projection $\bar{Y} \rightarrow Y$. We have the following commutative diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \bar{X} & \xrightarrow{p} & X \\ \bar{\pi} \downarrow & & \downarrow \pi \\ \bar{Y} & \xrightarrow{\tilde{p}} & Y \end{array}$$

Theorem 3.1. *If π is tamely ramified and $\mathcal{E}$ is a locally free G -sheaf on X , then the equivariant Euler characteristic $\chi(G, X, \mathcal{E})$ lies in the image of the Cartan homomorphism $c : K_0(k[G]) \rightarrow K_0(G, k)$.*

Proof. Follows directly from Theorem 1 in [Na]. $\square$

Theorem 3.2. *Let $D = \sum_{P \in |X|} n_P P$ be a G -equivariant divisor on X .*

- (a) *If π is weakly ramified and $n_P \equiv -1 \pmod{e_P^w}$ for all $P \in X$, then the equivariant Euler characteristic $\chi(G, X, \mathcal{L}(D))$ lies in the image of the Cartan homomorphism $c : K_0(k[G]) \rightarrow K_0(G, k)$. If moreover one of the cohomology groups $H^i(X, \mathcal{L}(D))$, $i = 0, 1$, vanishes, then the other one is a projective $k[G]$ -module.*

(b) Let $\deg D > 2g_X - 2$. If the $k[G]$ -module $H^0(X, \mathcal{L}(D))$ is projective, then π is weakly ramified and $n_P \equiv -1 \pmod{e_P^w}$ for all $P \in |X|$.

Proof. If k is algebraically closed, the theorem coincides with Theorem 2.1 in [Kö2].

In the general case, if π is weakly ramified and D satisfies the congruence condition “ $n_P \equiv -1 \pmod{e_P^w}$ for all P ”, then $\bar{\pi} : \bar{X} \rightarrow \bar{Y}$ is weakly ramified, and by Lemma 1.5, the divisor p^*D on $\bar{X}$ also satisfies the congruence condition. By the special case, $\chi(G, X, \mathcal{L}(p^*D))$ then lies in the image of $\bar{c}$. Hence by Proposition 2.1, $\chi(G, X, \mathcal{L}(D))$ lies in the image of c . Here we have used that $H^i(X, \mathcal{L}(D)) \otimes_k \bar{k} = H^i(\bar{X}, \mathcal{L}(p^*D))$ for every i (cf. Proposition III.9.3 in [Ha]). This also implies the rest of part (a).

For part (b), let $\deg D > 2g_X - 2$. and let $H^0(X, \mathcal{L}(D))$ be projective. Then $\deg p^*D > 2g_{\bar{X}} - 2$ and $H^0(\bar{X}, \mathcal{L}(D))$ is projective. Thus $\bar{\pi} : \bar{X} \rightarrow \bar{Y}$ is weakly ramified and the congruence condition holds. But then π is weakly ramified also, and the congruence condition holds for D , again by Lemma 1.5. $\square$

The following theorem generalizes Theorem 4.3 in [Kö2] and will be used in the formulation of the (main) Theorem 3.4. We refer the reader to page 1101 of the paper [Kö2] for an account of the nature, significance and history of the “ramification module” $N_{G,X}$ and for simplifications of formulae (1) and (2) when π is tamely ramified.

Theorem 3.3. *Let π be weakly ramified. Then there is a projective $k[G]$ -module $N_{G,X}$ such that*

$$\bigoplus_{P \in X}^n N_{G,X} \cong \bigoplus_{P \in X} \bigoplus_{d=1}^{e_P^t - 1} \bigoplus_{d=1}^{e_P^w \cdot d} \text{Ind}_{I_P}^G (\text{Cov}((\mathfrak{m}_P/\mathfrak{m}_P^2)^{\otimes d})), \quad (1)$$

where Cov denotes the $k[I_P]$ -projective cover. The class of $N_{G,X}$ in $K_0(G, k)$ is given by

$$[N_{G,X}] = (1 - g_Y)[k[G]] - \chi(G, X, \mathcal{L}(E)) \quad (2)$$

where E denotes the G -equivariant divisor $E := \sum_{P \in X} (e_P^w - 1) \cdot P$.

Proof. Theorem 4.3 in [Kö2] yields that there is a projective $\bar{k}[G]$ -module $N_{G,\bar{X}}$ such that

$$\bigoplus_{Q \in \bar{X}}^n N_{G,\bar{X}} \cong \bigoplus_{Q \in \bar{X}} \bigoplus_{d=1}^{e_Q^t - 1} \bigoplus_{d=1}^{e_Q^w \cdot d} \text{Ind}_{G_Q}^G (\text{Cov}((\mathfrak{m}_Q/\mathfrak{m}_Q^2)^{\otimes d})),$$

and that the class of $N_{G,\bar{X}}$ is given by

$$[N_{G,\bar{X}}] = (1 - g_{\bar{Y}})[\bar{k}[G]] - \chi(G, X, \mathcal{L}(\bar{E}))$$

where $\bar{E} := \sum_{Q \in \bar{X}} (e_Q^w - 1) \cdot Q = p^*E$. Thus $[N_{G,\bar{X}}] = \beta(\mathcal{C})$ where

$$\mathcal{C} := (1 - g_Y)[k[G]] - \chi(G, X, \mathcal{L}(E)) \in K_0(G, k).$$

By Corollary 2.2, $\mathcal{C}$ is the class of some projective $k[G]$ -module, say $N_{G,X}$. Using Lemma 1.3 and the injectivity of β , one easily shows that $N_{G,X}$ satisfies Formula (1). $\square$

For every point $P \in X$, let f_P denote the residual degree $[k(P) : k(\pi(P))]$.

Theorem 3.4 (Equivariant Riemann-Roch formula). *Let π be weakly ramified.*

- (a) *Let $P \in |X|$ be a closed point. For every $d \in \{0, \dots, e_P^t - 1\}$, there is a unique projective $k[G_P]$ -module $W_{P,d}$ such that*

$$\mathrm{Ind}_{I_P}^{G_P}(\mathrm{Cov}((\mathfrak{m}_P/\mathfrak{m}_P^2)^{\otimes(-d)})) \cong \bigoplus_{f_P}^{f_P} W_{P,d}$$

as $k[G_P]$ -modules.

- (b) *Let $D = \sum_{P \in X} n_P \cdot P$ be a divisor on X with $n_P \equiv -1 \pmod{e_P^w}$ for all $P \in X$. For any $P \in X$, we write*

$$n_P = (e_P^w - 1) + (l_P + m_P e_P^t) e_P^w$$

with $l_P \in \{0, \dots, e_P^t - 1\}$ and $m_P \in \mathbb{Z}$. Furthermore, for any $R \in Y$, fix a point $\tilde{R} \in \pi^{-1}(R)$. Then we have in $K_0(k[G])_{\mathbb{Q}}$:

$$\begin{aligned} \chi(G, X, \mathcal{L}(D)) \\ = -[N_{G,X}] + \sum_{R \in Y} \sum_{d=1}^{l_{\tilde{R}}} [\mathrm{Ind}_{G_P}^G(W_{P,d})] + \left(1 - g_Y + \sum_{R \in Y} [k(R) : k] m_{\tilde{R}} \right) [k[G]]. \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

Proof. We first show that under the preconditions of (b), the following holds in the Grothendieck group with rational coefficients $K_0(k[G])_{\mathbb{Q}}$:

$$\begin{aligned} \chi(G, X, \mathcal{L}(D)) = -[N_{G,X}] + \sum_{R \in Y} \frac{1}{f_{\tilde{R}}} \sum_{d=1}^{l_{\tilde{R}}} [\mathrm{Ind}_{I_{\tilde{R}}}^G(\mathrm{Cov}((\mathfrak{m}_{\tilde{R}}/\mathfrak{m}_{\tilde{R}}^2)^{\otimes(-d)}))] \\ + \left(1 - g_Y + \sum_{R \in Y} [k(R) : k] m_{\tilde{R}} \right) [k[G]] \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

With suitably chosen divisors D , Formula (4) will then be used to show part (a). Formula (4) and part (a) obviously imply part (b).

For curves over algebraically closed fields, we have $f_P = 1$ for all P , so Formula (4) coincides with Theorem 4.5 in [Kö2].

The injective homomorphism $\beta : K_0(G, k) \rightarrow K_0(G, \bar{k})$ maps $\chi(G, X, \mathcal{E})$ to $\chi(G, \bar{X}, p^* \mathcal{E})$, and by Theorem 3.2, both of these Euler characteristics lie in the image of the respective Cartan homomorphisms. Hence it suffices to show that β maps every summand of the right-hand side of formula (3) (applied to X, D) to the corresponding summand of the right-hand side applied to $\bar{X}, p^* D$.

From the proof of Theorem 3.3, we see that $\beta([N_{G,X}]) = [N_{G,\bar{X}}]$.

By Lemma 1.5, we have $l_Q = l_P$ and $m_Q = m_P$ whenever $Q \in p^{-1}(P)$. Furthermore, the number of preimages of a point $R \in Y$ under $\pi : X \rightarrow Y$ is $\frac{n}{e_{\tilde{R}} f_{\tilde{R}}}$. For any $S \in |\bar{Y}|$,

fix a point $\tilde{S} \in \bar{\pi}^{-1}(S)$. Using Lemma 1.3, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} \beta & \left(\sum_{R \in Y} \frac{1}{f_{\tilde{R}}} \sum_{d=1}^{l_{\tilde{R}}} [\text{Ind}_{I_{\tilde{R}}}^G (\text{Cov}((\mathfrak{m}_{\tilde{R}}/\mathfrak{m}_{\tilde{R}}^2)^{\otimes(-d)}))] \right) \\ &= \sum_{Q \in \bar{X}} \frac{e_Q}{n} \sum_{d=1}^{l_Q} [\text{Ind}_{G_Q}^G (\text{Cov}((\mathfrak{m}_Q/\mathfrak{m}_Q^2)^{\otimes(-d)}))] \\ &= \sum_{S \in \bar{Y}} \sum_{d=1}^{l_{\tilde{S}}} [\text{Ind}_{G_{\tilde{S}}}^G (\text{Cov}((\mathfrak{m}_{\tilde{S}}/\mathfrak{m}_{\tilde{S}}^2)^{\otimes(-d)}))] \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, we have

$$\beta \left(\left(1 - g_Y + \sum_{R \in Y} [k(R) : k] m_{\tilde{R}} \right) [k[G]] \right) = \left(1 - g_{\bar{Y}} + \sum_{S \in \bar{Y}} m_{\tilde{S}} \right) [\bar{k}[G]],$$

which completes the proof of Formula (4).

We now prove part (a). Let $P \in X$ be a closed point. For $d = 0$, the statement is obvious because $(\mathfrak{m}_P/\mathfrak{m}_P^2)^0$ is the trivial one-dimensional $k(P)$ -representation of I_P , so it decomposes into f_P copies of the trivial one-dimensional $k(R)$ -representation of I_P , where $R := \pi(P)$. Hence we only need to do the inductive step from d to $d + 1$, for $d \in \{0, \dots, e_P^t - 2\}$.

If π is unramified at P , then $e_P^t = 1$, so there is no $d \in \{0, \dots, e_P^t - 2\}$. Hence we may assume that π is ramified at P . Set $H := G_P$, the decomposition group at P , and let π' denote the projection $X \rightarrow X/H =: Y'$. For every closed point $Q \in |X|$ and for every $s \geq -1$, let $H_{Q,s}$ be the s -th ramification group at Q with respect to that cover, as introduced in Section 1. Then we have $H_{Q,s} = G_P \cap G_{Q,s}$ for every $s \geq -1$ and every $Q \in |X|$. In particular, if π is weakly ramified, then so is π' . For $Q = P$, we get $H_{P,s} = G_{P,s}$ for all $s \geq -1$; in particular, the ramification indices and residual degrees of π and π' at P are equal.

Let now $D := \sum_{Q \in |X|} n_Q \cdot Q$ be the H -equivariant divisor with coefficients

$$n_Q = \begin{cases} (d+2)e_Q^w - 1 & \text{if } Q = P \\ e_Q^w - 1 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Then formula (4) applied to H, X, D gives

$$\begin{aligned} \chi(H, X, \mathcal{L}(D)) &= -[N_{H,X}] + \frac{1}{f_P} \sum_{n=1}^d [\text{Ind}_{I_P}^H (\text{Cov}((\mathfrak{m}_P/\mathfrak{m}_P^2)^{\otimes(-n)}))] \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{f_P} [\text{Ind}_{I_P}^H (\text{Cov}((\mathfrak{m}_P/\mathfrak{m}_P^2)^{\otimes(-(d+1)}))] + (1 - g_{Y'})[k[H]] \quad (5) \end{aligned}$$

in $K_0(k[H])_{\mathbb{Q}}$. By the induction hypothesis, the sum from $n = 1$ to d in this formula is divisible by f_P in $K_0(k[H])$; hence the remaining fractional term $\frac{1}{f_P} [\text{Ind}_{I_P}^H (\text{Cov}((\mathfrak{m}_P/\mathfrak{m}_P^2)^{\otimes(-(d+1)}))] must lie in $K_0(k[H])$. In other words, when writing $\text{Ind}_{I_P}^H (\text{Cov}((\mathfrak{m}_P/\mathfrak{m}_P^2)^{\otimes(-(d+1)}))$ as a direct sum of indecomposable projective $k[H]$ -modules, every summand occurs with a multiplicity divisible by f_P . This proves the assertion. $\square$$

In the proof of Theorem 3.4(a), we have used a preliminary version of the equivariant Riemann-Roch formula to show the divisibility of $\text{Ind}_{I_P}^{G_P}(\text{Cov}((\mathfrak{m}_P/\mathfrak{m}_P^2)^{\otimes(-d)}))$ by f_P , i.e. we have used a global argument to prove a local statement. This tells us very little about the structure of the summands $W_{P,d}$, which leads to the question whether one could find a “local” proof for the divisibility. In two different situations, the following proposition provides such a proof, yielding a concrete description of $W_{P,d}$.

Proposition 3.5. *Assume that π is tamely ramified, let $P \in |X|$ and $d \in \{1, \dots, e_P^t - 1\}$.*

- (a) *If $\text{Gal}(k(P)/k(\pi(P)))$ is abelian, then we have $W_{P,d} \cong (\mathfrak{m}_P/\mathfrak{m}_P^2)^{\otimes(-d)}$ as $k[G_P]$ -modules.*
- (b) *If I_P is central in G_P , then $W_{P,d}$ is of the form $W_{P,d} = \text{Ind}_{I_P}^G(\chi_d)$ for some $k[I_P]$ -module χ_d . If moreover $G_P \cong I_P \times G_P/I_P$, then $W_{P,d} \cong (\mathfrak{m}_P/\mathfrak{m}_P^2)^{\otimes(-d)}$ as $k[G_P]$ -modules.*

Note that since every Galois extension of a finite field is cyclic, the first part of this proposition gives a “local” proof of Theorem 3.4(a) for the important case where π is tamely ramified and the underlying field k is finite.

Proposition 3.5 can be deduced from the following purely algebraic result. Note that, in this result, we don’t use the notations introduced earlier in this paper; when Proposition 3.6 is being applied to prove Proposition 3.5, the fields k and l become the fields $k(\pi(P))$ and $k(P)$, respectively, the group G becomes G_P and V becomes $(\mathfrak{m}_P/\mathfrak{m}_P^2)^{\otimes(-d)}$ which is viewed only as a representation of I_P (and not of G_P) in Theorem 4.6(a).

Proposition 3.6. *Let l/k be a finite Galois extension of fields. Let G be a finite group, and let I be a cyclic normal subgroup of G , such that $G/I \cong \text{Gal}(l/k)$, i.e. we have a short exact sequence*

$$1 \rightarrow I \rightarrow G \rightarrow \text{Gal}(l/k) \rightarrow 1.$$

Let V be a one-dimensional vector space over l such that G acts semilinearly on V , that is, for any $g \in G, \lambda \in l, v, w \in V$, we have $g.(\lambda v + w) = \bar{g}(\lambda)(g.v) + g.w$, where $\bar{g}$ denotes the image of g in $\text{Gal}(l/k)$.

- (a) *If $\text{Gal}(l/k)$ is abelian, then we have $\text{Ind}_I^G \text{Res}_I^G(V) \cong \bigoplus^{(G:I)} V$ as $k[G]$ -modules.*
- (b) *If I is central in G , then there is a (non-trivial) one-dimensional k -representation χ of I such that $\text{Res}_I^G(V) \cong \bigoplus^{(G:I)} \chi$ as $k[I]$ -modules.*
If moreover $G = I \times \text{Gal}(l/k)$, then we have $\text{Ind}_I^G \chi \cong V$ and $\text{Ind}_I^G \text{Res}_I^G(V) \cong \bigoplus^{(G:I)} V$ as $k[G]$ -modules.

Proof. (a) We have (isomorphisms of $k[G]$ -modules):

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Ind}_I^G \text{Res}_I^G(V) &\cong V \otimes_k \text{Ind}_I^G(k) && \text{by Corollary 10.20 in [CR]} \\ &\cong V \otimes_k k[G/I] && (\text{cf. §10A in [CR]}) \\ &\cong V \otimes_k k[\text{Gal}(l/k)] && \text{as } \text{Gal}(l/k) \cong G/I \\ &\cong V \otimes_k l \\ &\cong \bigoplus_{\sigma \in \text{Gal}(l/k)} V. \end{aligned}$$

The last two isomorphisms can be derived as follows. By the normal basis theorem, there is an element $x_0 \in l$ such that $\{g(x_0) | g \in \text{Gal}(l/k)\}$ is a basis of l over k . The resulting isomorphism

$$\begin{aligned} k[\text{Gal}(l/k)] &\rightarrow l \quad \text{given by} \\ [g] &\mapsto g(x_0) \quad \text{for every } g \in \text{Gal}(l/k). \end{aligned}$$

is obviously $k[G]$ -linear. This is the second last isomorphism. For the last one, we define

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi : l \otimes_k V &\rightarrow \bigoplus_{\sigma \in \text{Gal}(l/k)} V \quad \text{by} \\ a \otimes v &\mapsto (\sigma(a) \cdot v)_{\sigma \in \text{Gal}(l/k)} \quad \text{for every } a \in l, v \in V. \end{aligned}$$

φ is an isomorphism of vector spaces over k , by the Galois Descent Lemma. If $\text{Gal}(l/k)$ is commutative, then φ is also compatible with the G -action on both sides: Let $a \in l$, $v \in V$, $g \in G$, then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi(g.(a \otimes v)) &= \varphi(\bar{g}(a) \otimes g.v) = ((\sigma \bar{g})(a) \cdot g.v)_{\sigma \in \text{Gal}(l/k)} = ((\bar{g}\sigma)(a) \cdot g.v)_{\sigma \in \text{Gal}(l/k)} \\ &= g.((\sigma(a) \cdot v)_{\sigma \in \text{Gal}(l/k)}) = g.\varphi(a \otimes v). \end{aligned}$$

- (b) Since I is cyclic, it acts by multiplication with e -th roots of unity, where e divides $|I|$. If I is central in G , then it follows that the e -th roots of unity are contained in k . For if h is a generator of I and $h.v = \zeta_e \cdot v$ for all $v \in V$, ζ_e an e -th root of unity, then we have for all $g \in G$ and all $v \in V$:

$$\bar{g}(\zeta_e)(g.v) = g.(\zeta_e v) = (gh).v = (hg).v = \zeta_e(g.v).$$

Hence for every $\bar{g} \in \text{Gal}(l/k)$, we have $\bar{g}(\zeta_e) = \zeta_e$, which means that ζ_e lies in k . Let now $\{x_1, \dots, x_f\}$ be a k -basis of V , where $f = (G : I)$. Then we have $V = kx_0 \oplus \dots \oplus kx_f$ not only as vector spaces over k , but also as $k[I]$ -modules, since

$$Ix_i = \{\zeta_e^j x_i | j = 0, \dots, e-1\} \subseteq kx_i$$

for every basis vector x_i . Furthermore, the summands kx_i are isomorphic as $k[I]$ -modules because I acts on each of them by multiplication with the same roots of unity in k . Setting for example $kx_1 =: \chi$, we can write

$$\text{Res}_I^G(V) \cong \bigoplus^f \chi$$

as requested.

Assume now that $G = I \times \text{Gal}(l/k)$. Then by the Galois Descent Lemma, we have

$$V \cong l \otimes_k V^{\text{Gal}(l/k)}$$

as $k[G]$ -modules, where I acts trivially on l and $\text{Gal}(l/k)$ acts trivially on $V^{\text{Gal}(l/k)}$. This is isomorphic to $l \otimes_k \chi$, where χ is regarded as a $k[G]$ -module via the projection $G = I \times \text{Gal}(l/k) \rightarrow I$. By the normal basis theorem, we have

$$l \otimes_k \chi \cong \text{Ind}_I^G(k) \otimes \chi = \text{Ind}_I^G(\chi),$$

so $V \cong \text{Ind}_I^G(\chi)$ as requested. Together with what we have shown before, this implies the last identity of the proposition:

$$\text{Ind}_I^G \text{Res}_I^G(V) = \text{Ind}_I^G(\bigoplus^f \chi) = \bigoplus^f V.$$

□

4 Some variants of the main theorem

Throughout the previous section, we have concentrated on the case where $\pi : X \rightarrow Y$ is weakly ramified and where the locally free G -sheaf we are considering comes from an equivariant divisor. If π is tamely ramified, we have the following variant of Theorem 3.4 for locally free G -sheaves that need not come from a divisor. It generalizes Corollary 1.4(b) in [Kö1].

Theorem 4.1. *Let $\pi : X \rightarrow Y$ be tamely ramified. Let $\mathcal{E}$ be a locally free G -sheaf of rank r on X . For every closed point $P \in |X|$ and for $i = 1, \dots, r$, let the integers $l_{P,i} \in \{0, \dots, e_P - 1\}$ be defined by the following isomorphism of $k(P)[I_P]$ -modules:*

$$\mathcal{E}(P) \cong \bigoplus_{i=1}^r (\mathfrak{m}_P / \mathfrak{m}_P^2)^{\otimes l_{P,i}}.$$

For every $R \in |Y|$, let $\tilde{R} \in |X|$ and $W_{\tilde{R},d}$ be defined as in Theorem 3.4. Furthermore, let $N_{G,X}$ be the ramification module from Theorem 3.3. Then we have in $K_0(k[G])$:

$$\chi(G, X, \mathcal{E}) \equiv -r[N_{G,X}] + \sum_{R \in Y} \sum_{i=1}^r \sum_{d=1}^{l_{\tilde{R},i}} [\text{Ind}_{G_{\tilde{R}}}^G(W_{\tilde{R},d})] \pmod{\mathbb{Z}[G]}.$$

Moreover, one can show an equivariant Riemann-Roch formula for *arbitrarily ramified covers* $\pi : X \rightarrow Y$. Recall that in Theorem 3.2, we have shown that in virtually all cases where the Euler characteristic lies in the image of the Cartan homomorphism, the cover π is weakly ramified. So in the general case, one cannot possibly find a formula in the Grothendieck group $K_0(k[G])$ of projective $k[G]$ -modules. However, in the Grothendieck group $K_0(G, k)$ of all $k[G]$ -modules, we have the following result, which generalizes Theorem 3.1 in [Kö2].

Theorem 4.2. *Let $\mathcal{E}$ be a locally free G -sheaf. Then we have in $K_0(G, k)$:*

$$n \chi(G, X, \mathcal{E}) = C_{G,X,\mathcal{E}} [k[G]] - \sum_{P \in |X|} e_P^w \sum_{d=0}^{e_P^t-1} d [\text{Ind}_{I_P}^G (\mathcal{E}(P) \otimes_{k(P)} (\mathfrak{m}_P / \mathfrak{m}_P^2)^{\otimes d})],$$

where

$$C_{G,X,\mathcal{E}} = r(1 - g_X) + \deg \mathcal{E} + \frac{r}{2} \sum_{P \in |X|} [k(P) : k](e_P^t - 1).$$

We omit the proofs of Theorem 4.1 and Theorem 4.2 due to their similarity with the proof of Theorem 3.4.

References

- [Bo] N. BORNE, *Une formule de Riemann-Roch équivariante pour les courbes*, thesis, Univ. Bordeaux, 1999. Available online at <http://tel.archives-ouvertes.fr/tel-00001272/en>
- [CR] C.W. CURTIS, I. REINER, *Methods of Representation Theory*, Wiley, New York 1981

- [CW] C. CHEVALLEY, A. WEIL, *Über das Verhalten der Integrale erster Gattung bei Automorphismen des Funktionenkörpers*, Hamb. Abh. **10** (1934), 358-361
- [EL] G. ELLINGSRUD, K. LØNSTED, *An equivariant Lefschetz formula for finite reductive groups*, Math. Ann. **251** (1980), 253-261
- [Ha] R. HARTSHORNE, *Algebraic Geometry*, Springer, New York 1977
- [Ka] E. KANI, *The Galois-module structure of the space of holomorphic differentials of a curve*, J. Reine Angew. Math. **367** (1986), 187-206
- [Kö1] B. KÖCK, *Computing the equivariant Euler characteristic of Zariski and étale sheaves on curves*, Homology Homotopy Appl. **7**, No.3 (2005), 83-98
- [Kö2] B. KÖCK, *Galois structure of Zariski cohomology for weakly ramified covers of curves*, American Journal of Mathematics **126** (2004), 1085-1107
- [Ku] E. KUNZ, *Kähler differentials*, Vieweg, Wiesbaden 1986
- [Na] S. NAKAJIMA, *Galois module structure of cohomology groups for tamely ramified coverings of algebraic varieties*, Journal of Number Theory **22** (1986), 115-123
- [Se1] J.-P. SERRE, *Corps locaux*, Publications de l'Institut de Mathématique de l'Université de Nancago VIII, Hermann, Paris 1962
- [Se2] J.-P. SERRE, *Représentations linéaires des groupes finis*, Hermann, Paris 1978